

Christian Education

Vol. XI

MARCH, 1928

No. 6

ROBERT L. KELLY, *Editor*

Contributing Editors

O. D. FOSTER

ALFRED WMS. ANTHONY

HERBERT E. EVANS

GARDINER M. DAY

WINIFRED WILLARD

*Published Monthly, Omitting July, August and September, at
Lime and Green Sts., Lancaster, Pa.*

*By The Council of Church Boards of Education in the
United States of America
111 Fifth Ave., New York, N. Y.*

October, 1927, to June, 1928

Entered as second-class matter March 29, 1926, at the Post Office at Lancaster, Pa., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on July 18, 1918. The subscription price is \$1.00 per annum; ten or more subscriptions 75 cents each; 25 cents for single copies.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
<i>Editorial</i>	347
The Princeton Conference, <i>Robert L. Kelly</i>	348
The Otterbein College Conference on Christian Education, <i>W. G. Clippinger</i>	352
The Ratio of Endowment Income, <i>Alfred Williams Anthony</i>	355
A Critical View of the University Field, <i>O. D. Foster</i>	357
The Educational Task of the Church at College and Uni- versity Centers, <i>James C. Baker</i>	365
The Place of Worship in the Educational Program of a Uni- versity Worker, <i>R. B. Weaver</i>	374
<i>Discussion</i>	379
Thomas S. Evans Goes to California, <i>O. D. Foster</i>	382
Report of Committee on Correlation of Bible Study in Sec- ondary Schools and Colleges, National Association of Biblical Instructors	384
Course of Study for Secondary Schools Offering a Unit of Bible for College Entrance	385
Among the Theological Seminaries, <i>Gardiner M. Day</i>	393
The Place of Religion in General Education, <i>J. Elliot Ross</i>	396
Report of the Committee on Normal Schools, <i>Katharine C.</i> <i>Foster</i>	404
The Worker's Bookshelf	406
<i>The Effective College</i>	407

Christian Education

Vol. XI

MARCH, 1928

No. 6

EDITORIAL

President Clippinger, of Otterbein College, is to be highly commended for setting an example of a most vital conference on Christian Education. The conference was held at the college February 7 and 8 and was attended by delegates drawn from the churches within the college constituency. The rule was for each church to send its pastor and a layman at the church's expense, and the College entertained all delegates as its guests. It was an experiment in adult Christian education.

The college authorities had made careful preparation through various thorough studies of Otterbein's field, constituency, curricula, methods of teaching, etc., and had something of real value to offer the delegates. The two days' lively discussion demonstrated the appreciation of the delegates and heartened the friends of the college. One or two people from outside the United Brethren fold were asked to come in and present vital problems from wider angles of vision. Altogether there was much that was stimulating and helpful to all who were present.

* * * * *

The office of the Council-Association has produced a book which seems destined to become notable in the literature of American higher education. Among the co-authors of *The Effective College* are some of the most distinguished college and university men in the country. The contents will be found on pages 409-410. For the first time in a book of this kind the significance of Christian education is given its proper place as a major interest of the college. The book has had a remarkable pre-publication sale.

R. L. K.

THE PRINCETON CONFERENCE

ROBERT L. KELLY

The Princeton Conference on Religion among College Men was a significant and hopeful event. In the first place, it demonstrated the truthfulness of a claim that the Council of Church Boards of Education has been making that the college and university administration is profoundly concerned for the moral and religious welfare of all its members. There were said to be 200 delegates at the conference, and while some of them were "guests"—those chiefly who are officially employed with the interdenominational agencies of student welfare and college administration—the conference was made up primarily of college and university officials and faculty members. The presiding officers of the general sessions were President Hibben of Princeton, Dean Hawkes of Columbia, and President Farrand of Cornell, and at the sectional meetings, President McConaughy of Wesleyan, Dean Mendell of Yale, President Hetzel of Pennsylvania State, and Mr. Lewis Perry of Phillips Exeter Academy. Dr. Rufus M. Jones of Haverford College was the Conference chaplain. Among the "guests" were the following Council members: Dr. W. C. Covert, Dr. F. W. Padelford, Dr. W. F. Sheldon, the Reverend C. Leslie Glenn, and R. L. Kelly.

President Hibben, President Wilkins of Oberlin, Headmaster Stearns of Phillips Academy, Martyn L. Keeler, an undergraduate of Yale, and President Henry Sloane Coffin of Union Theological Seminary, interpreted the state of religion among men. There was general agreement among them that about one-tenth of a typical body of college men are religiously-minded, about an equal number have dispensed with religion, and the other eighty per cent are indifferent.

The main student objections to religion, as pointed out by President Hibben, are that it is dogmatic, an obstacle to freedom of expression, and does not express reality. Only a few of them wrestle with these obstacles sufficiently to achieve independent thought, the power of self-legislation, and the deeper reality of the unseen. President Hibben's prayer for college men is that

they may have a lively imagination. A majority of them are bored by religion and much else besides.

Mr. Keeler showed a penetrating insight into the student mind. After all, he said, students are sitting on the spectator's bench. They have freedom from much of the moral responsibility of society. They are confused by the busy-ness of undergraduate life, they are increasingly led into academically critical thinking, they are trying to find the way in the midst of a multitude of new ideas. They have religious ideas but in the nature of the case not much religious experience because not much life experience.

Mr. Keeler was equally definite in listing the religious influences on the campus.

The students are interested in religion and carry on much private and group conversation on the topic. Religion is one of four or five topics that are most discussed. The volunteer organizations, while their influence is not wide, are effective with a few.

The backing given by the alumni who were and are religious men, is an important influence.

The courses in religion, while apt to be pietistic or coldly philosophical, are helpful where taught by sincere and impressive personalities. Religion should really count in the curriculum. The indifference of most faculty members and the irreligious attitude of some is the greatest deterrent to student religious life. Sometimes the chapel exercises are led by men who in their classes are irreverent and blasphemous.

The strongest influence pro or con, as the case may be, in the religious life is the attitude of the administration. The religious group is anxious for administrative encouragement. The administration alone can make a campus-wide appeal. "The solution, gentlemen, is in your hands."

Dr. Coffin insisted that we will never dignify religion in the colleges until we treat it as one of the major interests of the race. This may be done,—

By setting courses in the classrooms presided over by religious people.

By maintaining dignified corporate worship.

By encouraging the voluntary expression of the religious life.

By intensive presentations looking toward commitment to the religious life.

By the spirit of the college itself.

Religion is caught from those who have it in contagious form. Appoint the right men to the faculties. Do we really mean business?

Dean Sperry of the Harvard Divinity School held that the tendency to treat undergraduate students as the last court of appeal is not fair. They have neither the facts nor the experiences of the religious life.

Prayer and worship in the chapel and elsewhere are more important than the study of the Bible. Carry on such rites in the chapel as the athletes and the fans do in the stadium. Get the mystical effect of it. The morale is often better in the colleges without ecclesiastical background than in those with such. Put potted palms on the stage where the faculty should be.

Our students do not know what science is, any more than religion. All they get is the dogmatism—what the biologists and physicists and chemists tell them. Only the student gets beyond dogmatism in either science or religion who is on the outskirts of truth.

President Little of Michigan lists a series of nine "bogies" of religion. They were—

Death—and yet people are kept living who are suffering acutely from incurable diseases.

Birth—in a social system that spawns thousands upon thousands of unwanted children.

Recreation—countenanced in universities that tends to undo in leisure time the good done in the hours in the classroom.

Law enforcement—all wrapped up in hypocrisy and cant.

Wealth—the boys and girls are not particularly desirous of worshiping rich people.

Politics—why get out the vote under a system that disenfranchises millions in so far as a chance goes to vote for someone they approve?

International responsibility—the "me-first" attitude of so-called Christian countries causes the young to ask uncomfortable questions.

Marriage—why should a marriage be held intact until physical death dissolves a partnership where mental and spiritual death has already occurred?

The survival of mediaevalism in religion—"You must think as I think."

The group conference on worship recommended a beautiful chapel service, in a building with an esthetic appeal, with hymns that do not run counter to intelligence.

Professor Tweedy of Yale said the hardest thing that college worship has to contend against is sheer inertia and laziness of students and faculty alike.

The group on the place of religion in the curriculum reported through Professor Bond of Bucknell in favor of courses in religion that have the same academic credit and dignity as other courses.

The group on extra-curricular religious organizations called attention to the "laboratory" opportunity afforded by these "activities."

The preparatory school group declared for a rigid course in Bible study in the secondary schools, which would receive credit as a college entrance subject. Individual school men stressed the necessity of the right spirit, permeating the entire institution. "You cannot expect indifference on the part of the faculty to produce zeal on the part of the student." What happens to the preparatory school student, all of whose school life is interpreted in the light of religion, when he finds himself in a college nearly all of whose atmosphere is "secular?"

All agreed—school and college men alike—that religion for college men should be characterized by sincerity, beauty, hardness, comprehensiveness. As Professor Holmes of Swarthmore said, all subjects in the college should be treated on the religious level. Religion is an attitude of mind, not something inherent in a subject.

The Princeton Conference was a remarkable conference particularly because of what and where it was. As Dean Hawkes remarked, the most significant thing about it was the fact that it was held.

THE OTTERBEIN COLLEGE CONFERENCE ON CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

W. G. CLIPPINGER, President, Otterbein College

For a number of years Otterbein College has been engaged in an almost continuous campaign for the raising and collecting of money on campaign pledges. She has not been unmindful during this time of her educational obligations and opportunities. But by the very nature of the case interest and attention have been transferred by administrative officers and somewhat by the faculty from the real objectives of a college to the securing of ways and means of promoting it.

Since the completion of the recent million-dollar effort for endowment it occurred to the college authorities that they might call together leaders in their constituency and certain educational experts to raise the question, *Why a college after all?*

In harmony with this idea and through the cooperation of the patrons of the college, a conference on Christian Education was called for Tuesday and Wednesday, February 7 and 8. Members of the conference were selected by the Superintendents of the contributing Conferences and by other officials in the field. The college proposed that it would entertain the delegates free of charge, if they themselves would pay their traveling expenses. More than the designated number responded. A total of delegates and visitors of one hundred and twenty-five assembled for an intensive period of work. This was not a convention but a conference. No effort was made to secure a crowd. In fact, large numbers were not desired.

The general theme of the conference was "Aims, Ideals and Functions of the Christian College with particular reference to Otterbein." Three important questions were raised:

Whence have we come?

Where are we now?

Whither are we going?—or, in common parlance, "Where do we go from here?"

The purpose of the conference was to make a reappraisal of the functions of the college. The first session dealt largely with

an elaborate presentation of statistical material gathered in the last two years concerning the work of the college. Where do the students come from? What are they doing at present? What are their vocational tendencies and preferences? What are the alumni doing? The United Brethren students in other institutions—who? where? why? All this material was presented in chart or graph form.

The effect of the junior college movement on the church college was ably discussed by Dr. Robert L. Kelly, Executive Secretary of the Council of Church Boards of Education.

In the evening session Dr. Kelly spoke on a related theme "Breaking the Lock-Step." President A. A. Shaw, of Denison University, discussed the theme "A Church College of Liberal Arts."

Other appropriate themes were: "The Contribution of the Constituency in Creating Sentiment for Christian Education;" "The Contribution of the College to the Young People in the Field," with particular reference to the high school and the young people's societies; and "Training for Full-Time Christian Service," thinking in terms of pre-college, college, and post-college.

A committee on findings was instructed to bring in reports in the form of summaries, results, and conclusions, and to indicate how the benefit of this conference could be spread into the field. This committee recommended a continuation of these studies and the holding of a similar conference within a year or two to resume the consideration of the vital problems by the delegates.

An excerpt from the report suggests—

This conference has stressed religion and education. The eminent call of our constituency is that three fundamentals to life and action shall be written in the curriculum, and objectified in our institutional activities. There is no conflict between scholarship and the Christian religion.

A committee of five was authorized to study the educational and religious needs of the constituency of the college and report its findings from time to time.

The attendance and spirit of this conference surpassed our expectations, both of the college authorities and the delegates. Expressions like the following have been received:

I want to take this opportunity of thanking you for the putting on of this fine conference on Christian Education. It exceeded my highest expectations both in numbers and in interest. Great good must come from it.

* * * *

I want to convey to you the highest appreciation of the Educational Conference. . . . The most conservative and the most critical man in my delegation spoke again and again of his appreciation of the conference.

* * * *

I believe the conference was quite helpful in many respects, especially in revealing to us the problems that are now confronting our college.

* * * *

I take this means to advise you that I feel it was the most practical convocation of its kind I ever attended.

It might be said that this entire conception is unique in the history of Otterbein College and probably of colleges in general. It grew out of over a year's careful study by the Faculty Club of Otterbein of the "Aims, Purpose, and Functions of Otterbein College." The Faculty Club felt that whatever results had accrued from these studies should be passed on to the friends and supporters of the college.

This conference doubtless marks the beginning of a new period of thinking, and of cooperative thinking, on the part of hundreds of friends of the college.

THE RATIO OF ENDOWMENT INCOME

ALFRED WILLIAMS ANTHONY

For the stimulation of thought—perhaps of discussion—and certainly for the purpose of arriving at a sound operating policy, some perplexing problems should be stated which concern endowment funds.

So far as I am aware, no one has as yet answered this question:—What should be the ratio of the income derived from endowment to the income derived from other sources?

There are ordinarily four sources from which the income of any charitable organization may be derived: (1) From services which are paid for, tuition, rooms, meals, etc.; (2) From recurring and periodic contributions of friends and supporters; (3) From the yield of permanent invested funds, the gifts, as time passes, of a former generation; and (4) From grants out of tax funds made by some unit of government,—city, county, state or nation.

If all income were derived from earnings then the organization would cease to be charitable. If all were derived from contributions, then the institution might lack stability and be subject to variations of moods, both public and private, or dependent upon fluctuations of trade and industrial conditions, perhaps wholly unable to render service at the time when service is most needed.

If all income came from investments, then the institution, rich and independent, might become largely devitalized, cut off from popular, current sympathy and understanding; it might become so "institutionalized" as simply to keep certain men and measures in the saddle, when conditions have so changed as to make the institution out of date and out of tune with human needs.

As for grants from governments, it is fair to say that the tendency is to place the responsibility for human welfare more and more upon the groupings of men in political organizations. The whole of society is looked upon more and more as responsible for the adequate care of any of its needy parts. But society as a whole has limitations and inefficiency. Private charity can

frequently best make beginnings and do pioneering. Movements which pertain to religion, or ethics, or character-building may conflict with sectarian, class and race prejudices, and thereby become impossible for the state as a whole. We have recently discovered that higher education cannot safely be left to the control of the state, that legislators are not always good educators, and that education in its higher reaches needs to be as free from the control of the state as is religion.

With these qualifying considerations in mind, it becomes apparent that the ratio of income from the four ordinary sources is not easy to fix, cannot indeed be determined in an arbitrary fashion for any one given period, still less for all time to come, as might be involved in the case of permanent funds.

Here then appears one of the advantages of The Uniform Trust for Public Uses. It provides for the exercise of discretion at that moment in the future when it may become apparent that a given charity can no longer be maintained because of changed conditions and allows for application of the benefits then to the objects nearest akin to the original intention.

Discretion to be exercised in the future is the key to solving this involved question of ratios. Trustors should authorize trustees to use their discretion in circumstances and under conditions wisely conceived and carefully stated.

Philanthropic Finance

—The Hancher Organization—

740 Rush Street

Suite 505-7-9

Chicago

Our record shows more than \$87,500,000 pledged in 44 states, during 17 years, to 203 funds.

We serve schools, hospitals, churches, community funds and other philanthropies.

Our major activities are for institutions of the church of whatever denomination.

However, we successfully cooperate with those which are of independent management.

A CRITICAL VIEW OF THE UNIVERSITY FIELD

THE ANNUAL REPORT OF THE UNIVERSITY SECRETARY TO THE
COUNCIL OF CHURCH BOARDS OF EDUCATION, 1927-28

O. D. FOSTER

Our Executive Secretary proposed that I offer for my report this year a critical view of my field. Though in carrying out this task, I may be considered a wailer, I am persuaded with him that the effort should be made. With all the "fault finding" entailed in such a procedure, the writer is neither oblivious to, nor unappreciative of, the enormous amount of fine work that is being done at great sacrifice. So please help me to avoid giving the impression that everything is wrong, that nothing is right, and that we are all unprofitable servants putting up the best front we can to defend a lost cause.

Churches in Student Centers

Since strong local churches are basic in any successful religious program in a student center, we cannot overlook the problem of providing the best that is to be had for these strategic places. But speaking broadly, Protestant churches in these very centers are not well located, nor well constructed, nor well manned for student work. Their programs have little in them to attract and to hold students. They are impoverished in vision, leadership, pulpit ability and grip on young life. They are pathetically inadequate for the task the opportunity of the ages has so richly bestowed upon them.

Our Protestant system, or lack of a system rather, of national or provincial control, has resulted in this unfortunate state of affairs. Pulpits in these intellectual capitals cannot compete with their rivals in financial capitals in amplifying the still small voice of the Lord calling men to their leadership—men whose ears are attuned with a high degree of selectivity to greater financial wave lengths. This is not a criticism of the already underpaid men trying to live respectably under exacting conditions, but rather an indictment of the system that makes such a situa-

tion inevitable. This is one of the conspicuous weaknesses of Protestantism. Is there no way by which our ecclesiastical statesmen may solve this problem?

The Student Pastorate

The student pastorate has been on trial for some time. It has not developed any standardized form. Tendencies to swing to two extremes are noted, *i.e.*, to absolute local church control or to absolute independence of local church control. In the one case, the student pastor is in danger of becoming an echo, while in the other, the danger lies in his becoming an irresponsible free lance. In the one case, he may become an errand boy, while in the other, he may become a defiant independent. In the one case, he may be exceedingly industrious in doing petty things, while in the other, he may develop such economy toward hard work that he does nothing. The university pastorate has proven its value and won its place, but it certainly needs sympathetic surgery if it is to grow to full strength and maturity.

But after all, the problem of providing the proper personality is even greater than that of creating the best type of organization. The success of any plan depends upon the people working it. But to me, our chief blunder lies in thinking that *each* denomination *must* have *its own* representative, even if our means can provide no more than very mediocre talent. We are thus setting up for those measuring us and our church leaders locally, a very cheap standard. I am convinced that the cause for us all would be far better served if we were to pool our investments and secure talent and leadership.

The chief difficulty the interdenominational student pastor faces lies in giving satisfaction simultaneously to the churches, the Christian associations, and the administration. The degree of his success is usually determined by the extent to which he has served, in its own peculiar way, the group passing judgment upon him. Identity of interests do not seem to obtain. This accounts for the diverse reports we get on the success of a given man's work. His is a difficult but a challenging task.

Cooperation and Good Will

The prophet of peace should take courage when a group of young people assembled on a given afternoon can cooperate, co-ordinate, integrate and unionate, if you permit the expression, agencies involving centuries of anachronistic machinery, divers libraries of theological arsenals and hordes of highly trained leaders in the learning and technique of their professions. Though we smile at the mirth of innocence abroad, we must confess we often get further by humor than by logic.

Those of us who are devoting our lives to the furtherance of religious cooperation unfortunately are not so successful as our young people. The deeper we get into our problem with all its heart-aching disappointments, the more profound our conviction in the righteousness of it all *must* grow, if we are to "carry on" at all. To do this one must climb out of the deep and apparently unrelated gulches of the immediate difficulties to Pizgah's heights of the heart's understanding, there to catch the vision of the Promised Land of meaningful relationships.

We unfortunately slip backward occasionally toward the depths of our own sectarian self-interests, but when we view our efforts in the perspective of a decade, we see that we have climbed—all of us—to heights where we now behold with a somewhat understanding eye and sympathetic heart, hitherto unappreciated areas of religious group interests. Though woefully belated, we are happily coming to discover that there have been also among our Catholic and Jewish brethren, those who are sincerely struggling to reach Pizgah's heights. When we meet them in that divine atmosphere of our common Father's impartial love, in full view of the land to be possessed, with a better understanding of the relationship of the forces with which to possess it, we shake hands in sincere fellowship, with clearer vision and warmer hearts, resolving in deeper consecration to realize in spirit, though it takes centuries, that which our young people so naively accomplished in a single afternoon.

The American Association on Religion

Although but a struggling infant too young yet to elicit severe criticism by the older agencies, the American Association on Re-

ligion has made itself felt. It has enriched all of us who have been participating in the fellowship it has provided. It has been instrumental in making possible some most important pieces of work which our Council could not have done alone. It has given hope in some places at least that at last the three widely differing historical religious groups may find some common means of approach to the great state institutions of higher learning. It has inspired many to believe that a way may yet be found to bring into our state educational process the religious influence that is so direly needed. And it has met with the approval of educators in general far beyond the hopes even of its own best friends.

Conditions over which no one has had control have prevented the Association from making the progress some of us had hoped for it. But with all its delicate problems it has made distinct contributions in a number of our great state universities. Our opportunities as a Council are greatly enhanced through this broader council of concord without compromise or added expense.

Schools of Religion

Since so many are writing on this subject now a brief statement here will suffice. The number of schools is growing. They do not need to be planted so much as to be pruned and mulched. Half a score of universities are working now on new ones and as many more have written for encouragement to attempt others. The size and number of the attempts, significant as they are, are after all not so important as the wide-spread consciousness of the need of supplementing state education with religious instruction as witnessed in the ever-growing interest in them. Unfortunately many of these efforts have been poor excuses academically and consequently have proven to be liabilities to the movement. As a class, they do not merit the name "School" in a university.

The tendency now is to make the school as broadly cooperative as possible. The latest efforts emulate a type of cooperation that includes the institution and churches, at least those having national Boards of Education. This means ultimately that a national program is likely to be evolved including the Christian associations of the university, state college and normal school ad-

ministrators, the Council of Church Boards of Education and the proper Jewish and Catholic educational authorities.

To carry out such a program when evolved there will be required greatly enlarged budgets of the church Boards as well as millions invested in a national foundation, so constructed as to guarantee the rights and privileges of all concerned. Unfortunate indeed would it be if some well-meaning philanthropist were to establish a great national foundation which would not take into account all of these delicate interests. The great need of the field and the rich opportunities offered for service are becoming so widely known that the establishment of some national agency to deal with this problem is only a matter of time. The question before us as a Council is, What part do we propose to take in this marvelous opportunity?

So far these schools are in universities and state colleges. As yet no school has been inaugurated at a normal school where our greatest challenge lies. May the one planned soon develop. Would it not be wise for us to give more study to the normal school field, not only as our most promising field for schools of religion, but also for general religious developments?

The dangers of the schools of religion are many. Perhaps the greatest is that of too great reliance upon covering "subjects" or in giving "courses" in religion as character builders. This has often resulted in an antiquated formalism shorn of the vital interest in the laboratory of life. The *how* is vastly more important than the *what*. When "courses" or bodies of curricular material are treated as areas of appreciated opportunities for fellowship in the conquest of unfolding personality, this danger will have passed. Unless courses taught in religion, however high their academic value—and they must be high—really inspire the student to loftier thinking, nobler living, and a more unselfish service, they have been clanging cymbals and do not merit support. But unfortunately when we insist on "courses" in religion affecting the motivation of the students' lives, some of the university authorities seem to assume that we are a body of paid propagandists of a poisonous, bootleg, emotional evangelism, over which we, as pitiable deluded souls, seek to put the protection of academic sanctity, and for which we naively attempt to inveigle

the sanction of a super-state authority lodged so securely in their hands. Such an attitude cannot long be tolerated when adequate attempts are made. But great sympathy is due other university administrators in taking the attitude they must toward the pathetic excuses proposed for "credit courses" and "schools of religion."

In our eagerness to meet a need and not to seem to stifle initiative we have hesitated all too much in discouraging inopportune efforts. But with all our difficulties and shortcomings, we are here facing our greatest challenge for educational statesmanship. Both church and state educators have much to learn from each other. If American education is to serve the nation as it should in a dominantly materialistic age, the time is here when they must get together in working out a policy and procedure that more nearly meet the needs of the present situation.

Influence of the University Class Room

One hesitates to speak of the moral and religious influence of the university classroom, and yet he cannot overlook it in the consideration of the forces that have to make or to break the character of our young people while attending our great universities.

While the spirit of the university classroom is good, it is far from being excellent. Instructors generally do not consider their obligations to go beyond the instruction they are employed to give in their special subjects. To instruct, either by word or example, in morals or religion they do not consider to be enjoined upon them. But many of them do seem to consider that they have been commissioned by High Heaven itself to instruct the "credulous and previously misguided youth" to view with contempt the moral standards and teachings given them in their homes and churches. Our state system does not make it possible for us, it seems, to provide, though free of cost to the state, facilities to teach our young people religion in our state schools, but it does make possible the teaching of "irreligion," if you permit the expression, in these very institutions at the expense of the state. All this may be done from the sacred platform of "academic freedom" and is therefore inviolable. To question the

procedure would be meddling with the divine right of the state, or the integrity of the administration.

But in behalf of the 70 per cent. to 90 per cent. of the students in these institutions who come from our church homes, we have the right, if not the obligation, to request that a joint study be made of the whole problem by the Association of University Presidents and the educational authorities of the churches. The responsibility for this situation is ours in so far as we seem to be satisfied.

Attitude of University Administrators

I notice a greater readiness on the part of administrators of nonsectarian institutions of higher learning to cooperate with the American Association on Religion than with the Council of Church Boards of Education alone. They realize that they are dealing with a well balanced and a more comprehensive agency and are less hesitant to lend it their encouragement. Some of these administrators have been cooperating officially with our Association, not only in studying their own needs, but also in constructing programs to meet these needs. This has been one of the real gains made in our methods of work and its limits are set only by our own self-imposed limitations to cooperate among ourselves.

If having visited and studied somewhat carefully most of the American universities would give me the right to make an observation on what I consider to be an unwholesome situation, I would like to call attention to a tendency toward independent administrative autocracy over highly privileged communities with little regard to organized consciousness of the best elements within the states supporting their educational enterprises. Our present system of granting to administrators the freedom required for responsibility in leadership also makes possible, for the autocrat, the license to rule.

Relation of College and University Appropriations

In commenting on the meaning of the names of two leading cities in California an unknown writer said: "San means saint

and Angeles means angels," then humorously remarked, "but that was a long time ago." Our church colleges originally made religion central and vital in their educational problem, but many of them to be honest would also have to say: "But that was a long time ago." It is disappointing and disheartening to see so many of these colleges aping the great state university, apparently forgetting or even having any interest in fulfilling the mission for which they were established, or for meeting the chief, if not the only reason they have for existence, in their losing self-imposed struggle in competition with the tax-supported schools.

Yet even to the poorest grade of these non-producing schools, where we have but a few students, we grant money far more generously than to the religious work in our great state universities where more than one-half of our students actually are. We can support from one to five colleges, each of us, in a single state and yet in that very state, even after a disinterested individual has been induced to shoulder the main burden of the enterprise, all of us combined have not succeeded in financing one high-grade man to teach religion to our united groups of students in the most strategic venture in religious education in the history of America. In behalf of the church of the future, I ask, Where is our educational statesmanship? Is it not time to revise our policy to meet the needs of today? While not neglecting the college *we must do more at the university.*

The foregoing sounds unappreciative of the excellent work being done under trying conditions. All of our Boards are greatly handicapped and cannot do what they see should be done. All have the forward look and all are striving to realize their purposes. Without them and their continuous effort, without their continued cooperation, higher education would indeed become more and more materialistic. In your hands, as official representatives of the millions of church people, rests the future of religion in education. Consequently, you are more responsible for the character of our future citizenship than is comfortable to realize fully. You are to be congratulated on what you have done. May your successes in view of the even greater work to be done, inspire you sufficiently to enable you to carry into realization the vision you all have for your great work.

THE EDUCATIONAL TASK OF THE CHURCH AT COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY CENTERS*

JAMES C. BAKER, Minister of Trinity Methodist Episcopal Church, and Director of The Wesley Foundation at the University of Illinois

According to the official figures of the United States Bureau of Education there are now 769 colleges and universities under private control and 144 under public control with an attendance which gives a percentage of 64 to 10,000 of the population over against 13 to 10,000 in France and 15 to 10,000 in Great Britain.

Back of this growth, and furnishing the supply for all types of institutions, is the amazing growth of our public high schools. Here are the figures according to the U. S. Bureau of Education:

<i>Year</i>	<i>Schools</i>	<i>Attendance</i>
1870	800 plus	80,227
1890	2,500 "	297,894
1900		630,048
1910		1,032,461
1926	22,500	3,389,878

Note that the astonishing part of this growth has come since 1890. In that period the high school attendance has doubled in each decade. Professor Judd, of the University of Chicago, says,

In 1890 one of every ten children of high school age took advantage of the American opportunity for a free higher education. To-day one of every three children goes to high school. This statement holds for the United States as a whole, including rural areas and new states. There are, however, municipalities where two of every three children go to high school.

In the light of these facts we cannot be surprised that actual registration in our colleges and universities increased six times as rapidly as the population between 1890 and 1924. . . . At the present rate of increase we shall shortly have 1,000,000 students in colleges and universities. (Aibert W. Atwood, *Saturday Evening Post*, August 6, 1927.)

* An address before the Triennial Conference of Church Workers in Universities, January 5, 1928.

Even a casual reading of educational literature reveals the fact that parallel with this vast increase in our student bodies is a great dissatisfaction among educators with the educational program, alike as to its content, its methods and its goal. Especially is there a growing conviction that the results in the life of the student—the goal of the whole process—are decidedly unsatisfactory.

John Knox is reported to have said many years ago that the state has an asset in every man that it educates. While acknowledging that this is the achievement that is to be eagerly sought, we have to confess that many of those who go through our schools and colleges to-day are serious liabilities instead of assets. How to make sure that our educated youth will be an asset to our commonwealth, the nation and the world—this is the problem that is set for us to-day. Unless ideals of service and generosity supplant those of selfishness and greed, unless our students have social imagination and a deep sense of social responsibility, they will not add to the moral and spiritual capital of their generation and to the richness of its life, but will rather subtract from it. The first task of the college or university is to develop qualities of mind and of heart and of will, which taken together mean a dynamic, effective personality set in the midst of the opportunities and tasks of the modern campus and the modern world.

Several years ago William Allen White wrote his book, *A Certain Rich Man*—the picture of a student who went out from the university to live a selfish and unscrupulous life. White describes John Barclay's right hand as refined, savage, cunning, cruel, grasping—typical of the era that made him. "It is the menace of civilization—the danger to the race from the domination of sheer intellect without moral restraint."

There is a growing conviction that religion is the way through here. The story of Moses is a useful symbol to us. "He was learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians." As a member of Pharaoh's household he received all that that ancient state could bring him in the way of knowledge and equipment. But he also "endured as seeing Him who is invisible." Then the wealth of knowledge took on spiritual meaning and the accumulation of powers found spiritual use. Then he became an asset not only

to his generation but to all after time, "dear to God and famous to all ages."

The late lamented President Burton, of Michigan, is reported to have said, "The ultimate test of a state university is the moral and religious character of its graduates." This is the ultimate test of any institution of higher learning.

II

It is not necessary for me to describe for this audience the gradual secularization that has taken place in all types of institutions.

In the tax-supported institutions there is an especial problem of giving religion its just and necessary place. In some states there are constitutional hindrances. In all there is the recognition of some limitations due to our doctrine of the separation of church and state. Doubtless these last limitations have been over-emphasized, yet if so, it has been due in very considerable measure to the unhappy sectarian divisions and emphases in the church which have made it seem impossible to go far in integrating religion as part of the educational process of the university itself. Mr. Shillito, in a recent number of *The Christian Century* (Dec. 29, 1927), reports the story of a child who wrote, "There used to be wild animals in England, but because of Christianity there are few of them left; those that are left are to be found in the theological gardens." Alas! how mordantly accurate is the fact that animal tempers within the church itself have hindered the progress of religion within the state institutions of the country.

So far as religious instruction within the university life itself is concerned some interesting explorations are under way. For years we have had such affiliation as is represented by Wesley College at the University of North Dakota. Now we have the new project at the University of Iowa, which is shared in by the University itself.

What I am concerned to say here, without further discussion, is that if any college or university is at any point hindered, in the nature of the case, from the full use of the religious motive, then the church must accept the responsibility of cooperation to

the full extent of its belief in the fundamental need of religion for the freest and largest ethical life. This responsibility is all the more urgent because of the challenge for cooperation coming from responsible administrators within these institutions themselves. The most hopeful aspect of the whole situation, in my judgment, is the chorus of voices from the field of education saying that without religion we cannot achieve the goal of manhood and womanhood which is the only justification for our existence. Witness President Lowell's recent letter to Harvard Alumni.

Church workers in state universities have had much and varied opposition from within the ranks of so-called "Christian" educators—those responsible for the church college. The latest assertion, and the most amusing and superficial, is that the work of the "foundations" is not to be classed as "educational." Therefore the educational funds of the church should not be used to advance it. For this particular group of men to affirm that education is complete with "the academic process," narrowly described, is a pathetic illustration of a failure to see the reason for the very existence of their own institutions carried to its inevitable outcome in bringing the complementary service of the church to the confessedly incomplete program of the tax-supported university. *Religion must be in the educational process*—an integral and vital part—to make education complete.

The fundamental educational purposes of the "Christian college" and of the "foundations" are ultimately the same, *i.e.*, to develop qualities of mind and heart and will which assure the moral and religious character of students. In the case of the church college the church provides for all the instruments and factors involved in the educational process; in the case of the "foundations" the most expensive part is carried by the state with the church left to seek to penetrate the whole with the spirit and purpose and power of religion.

III

I wish now to come closer to our theme: "The Educational Task of the Church at College and University Centers." I do not understand that we are now to discuss the instruments through which our educational purpose is to be realized. The

vast importance of these instruments is recognized by giving all of the rest of the program of this Conference to them.

I therefore speak now concerning the religious needs of human life—especially the life of students—in the light of which the church must organize and adjust its plans and programs. In the discussion it will become more and more apparent that the task is fundamentally an educational one.

1. The first educational task of the church is in the field of "apologetics." I do not mean that the student wants to be taken into the lecture room or laboratory. He is not asking the church for philosophy, sociology, science, or politics, but he does want his religion integrated with his other human interests. He wants to know that the interpreter of religion comes to his task with a scientific mood and temper, with adequate training for his work, and with a background of knowledge of the currents of contemporary thinking and practice. Only recently one student who felt he had great difficulty in keeping his intellectual self-respect as he listened to his pastor, remarked, "Why can't we have experts in the field of religion as we have experts in history and science, men whose speech carries an authentic note?"

While a student is impatient with doctrines abstractly stated or obscured by an outworn vocabulary, he is deeply interested in the intellectual content of his religion. No one wins a readier hearing among college students than one who opens up the meanings of religion if he speaks in the vocabulary of the present day and if he is openminded, tolerant and free from dogmatism. Many a student is eager to rethink in terms of his own life, the meaning of God, Christ, prayer, duty, immortality. The profounder the theme the greater the interest. Religion is the most fascinating of all topics if we only know how to talk about it without hackneyed phrases of second-hand piety and antiquated theology.

Consider how great is the need of this intellectual interpretation of religion for the student to-day. He faces a mechanistic interpretation of life ably advocated by certain philosophers. He has been told that intelligence cannot live with religious faith, that there is an irreconcilable conflict between science and re-

ligion. For this confusion the church itself is to a large degree responsible.

Then we must add the fact that there is a negative influence on the part of some professors who are openly committed to materialistic, positivistic, mechanistic, behavioristic construction of life and experience which frankly leaves no place for God and spiritual interpretation of life and the universe in human experiences.

Further many teachers have developed a very clear anti-religious complex which leads them to go out of their way to scoff at the great faiths of humanity.

How poorly the work of the church has been done in the teaching of doctrine may be seen in the "religious illiteracy" of even many of those faculty men who recognize the place of religion and wish to cooperate in its development among the students.

One cannot leave such a statement as though it were an indictment of all teachers. For some of the most helpful of "apologetic" interpretation is coming from faculty men. Recall, for example, the work of President Hopkins among Dartmouth men or the writings of men like Millikan, Whitehead, Coulter, Conklin and many others. Only last year *Scribner's* published a remarkable series of addresses to students by members of the Harvard faculty on "Religion and Modern Life."

Emerson's exhortation to the preacher is a great word for all interested in the higher life of humanity: "Be an opener of doors to those who come after you, and don't try to make the universe a blind alley."

2. The second phase of our educational task is in the field of ethics. There is a great confusion in the minds of the present generation concerning moral standards and consequently a tremendous need of definition and conviction.

I make my own here these words of Sherwood Eddy:

No other rising generation ever followed a world war that resulted in the destruction of so many established customs and moral standards. No other generation of youth ever had such freedom—and new freedom may be either an emancipating or a devastating thing. No other generation in this country ever faced the insistent demand for equality

between the sexes resulting in the new freedom for woman. No other has ever had such high-powered playthings placed in its hands as the auto, the radio, the moving picture, together with so much leisure and spending money. No other was ever subjected to the seduction of such commercialized amusements, or such a rapid increase in the circulation of obscene literature and sex periodicals.*

One of the fiercest and most persistent of creeds to-day is that man is an animal *like* other animals. Selfishness is the supreme law of animal life and consequently self-interest is the only legitimate human impulse. Appetite is the supreme force of the human heart. Personal gain by day, passionate indulgence by night are the only ultimate hopes and desires. Man is in no sense his brother's keeper. The idea of service is sheer sentimentalism, "Slave morality." The only rule that works is not the Golden Rule but the good old rule of Rob Roy:

"The simple plan
That they shall take who have the power
And they shall keep who can."

Such character as man has comes from the successful struggle for existence. Man, by the process of experience, comes to know when it is best to tell the truth and when it is wise to lie. Love is simply an incident of the physical organism and religion is a troublesome superstition to be gotten rid of as quickly as possible.

Many have tried to think out human life in this way and multitudes are trying to live out human life on this animal hypothesis. If you question the truth of my statement, turn to the tides of so-called "realistic" literature pouring from the press to-day, much of it clever but without the understanding heart, much of it in the service of sensual gratification, assuming that it is the inevitable portion of mankind to wallow in the "formless unchanneled turmoil of instinct and passion." And these books and magazines are companioned by a multitude of plays and moving pictures based upon the same estimate of human life. "A piteous chronicle of diseased frivolity and tainted appetite which persistently exhibits humanity under its least worthy aspects,

* *Religion and Social Justice*, 76f.

under the sway of the least elevating motives and passions, with an increasing accompaniment of winks, leers, giggles, and grimaces."

Every university has some who affect the scoffer's art with its habit of mocking, of turning everything into a jest or sneering sarcastically. Sometimes it is an intellectual pose of the clever or near-clever. A good deal of bull-doing is done in such terms as "no thinking men," "all scientific men," "narrow." Again it is a moral pose. The assumption is that one is not green or innocent but very experienced in life—full of worldly wisdom. Therefore, one sneers at the fine touches of sentiment and claims freedom from all moral convictions and decencies. "I am no Puritan" is the common remark. Such a one scoffs at the ideas of obligation and service. He seeks to browbeat others into approving and sharing much of which they ought to be heartily ashamed. "They forget it is better to be green than to be rotten, for greenness at least has promise, rottenness has none."

Let me bring two unconventional witnesses concerning the situation which the undergraduate, in common with all youth, faces to-day. The first one is Walter Lippmann, one of the editors of the *New York World*, a very brilliant social student. In his book *Drift and Mastery* he says "Our battle to-day is with the chaos of a new freedom." He describes what he calls "the scattered souls" of men "in revolt because they are in revolt, because they know not what they are after, but because they want to rebel."

"I know one man, a painter, who says, 'All I want to do is to bewilder and to fascinate'." Another said to him "All we need is wiggle," and a third said "To be alive is to rebel."

My second unconventional witness is Henry Canby, editor of the *Saturday Review of Literature*. He describes "a new dogmatism,"—"an anti-Puritanism which is in the worst sense Puritanical."

The modern Bohemia is a looking-glass in which all compulsions are reversed. . . . You must not be too moral, you must not control your passions, you must not sacrifice yourself for others, you must not love your neighbor or even your family one-fourth as much as yourself.

A multitude to-day under a false idea of liberty are engaged in a St. Vitus dance of experiment. Some of them are as afraid of what they call inhibitions as ancient peoples used to be afraid of the Devil. To be inhibited is to be decent and of all things they do not want to be decent, and so they have no inhibitions. They are on a slide with a clutter of all our dishes down the backstairs of civilization.

All this must be met with the competent and clear Christian philosophy. Over against this cheapening of human nature must be put the wonder and glory of human life. A stern morality must be stated and illumined and made commanding.

Appetites men have, but they are not all appetite; passions men have, but they are not all passions; struggles for life but they are not all struggles for life; kindred with the animals they are, but also kindred with something higher. There is the longing for beauty, the hunger for righteousness, the aptitude for succoring the distressed, the hope of a better life, the sense of an eternal moral order uttering itself through the conscience of the individual and the conscience of society. There is the supreme capacity for God, and for becoming His leaders and servants to our fellow-men.

The Chicago Theological Seminary

(Founded in 1855)

A graduate school for the training of leaders in all branches of Christian service. Affiliated with the University of Chicago. Courses open to men and women.

Full catalog furnished on request.

OZORA S. DAVIS, President

FRANK G. WARD, Dean

5757 University Avenue, Chicago

THE PLACE OF WORSHIP IN THE EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM OF A UNIVERSITY WORKER*

R. B. WEAVER, University Pastor, Michigan State College

Whoever phrased this subject, "The Place of Worship in the Educational Program," penetrated to the most refined force touched by education—that is, worship. Worship comes more deeply from the individual and goes more deeply into the divine than any other ability. Hence, the talent for worship is the most essential faculty in man subject to educational influence.

To isolate this term, worship, or to surround it with a group of definite synonyms, is an exacting problem. The word is set about with an immense number of historical and personal connotations. I feel, then, that I must begin with some dogma; and, for the purpose of this paper, I shall let the conception which I have sensed in the student mind determine the dogma.

There are, I think, at least two great sets of synonyms banking this word, worship. Let us call one the Obsequious Set, or the King Set. Let us call the other the Affection Set, or the Father Set. In the first group one senses the attitude of extreme homage, obsequious respect, a bowing and bending down in court-like honor and praise and adulation. In the second group one senses chiefly love, love which has assimilated even veneration and adoration and which has risen into the supremely intimate. The former group, still suggestive of the oriental court, I believe to have little effect upon the natural student mind; the latter group, suggestive of that joyous, healthy, and even radiant state of the soul which Jesus manifested and which He told out so distinctly through the crisis in the story of the Prodigal Son—this group, I believe, arrests the student mind. Tentatively, then, shall we say that worship is an interflux of love between man and his Father, a love that is normal and natural even when ecstatic? And, in so far as man is concerned, following the story of the Prodigal Son, shall we say that wor-

* An address before the Triennial Conference of Church Workers in Universities, January 5, 1928.

ship is a *going home to the Father?* (I believe that one can see at once the immense significance in this concept should we be able to make a church what Jesus called it, "My Father's house.")

Now this kind of worship, in the student mind, I have found to be "tript off" whenever any of the vital virtues get into the blood. Some beauty, some goodness, some truth found in silence or stumbled upon suddenly among the divine chances of everyday living—these things excite a state of worship in the student mind. Few students any longer dwell either on the hill in Samaria or on that other temple-encrusted hill in Jerusalem; and when they do worship the Father, they worship Him "in spirit and in truth."

I wonder if the central problem posed in our assignment is not the spiritually transcendent problem not only of erecting man above himself but of erecting the church above itself? How can we make a physical church a spiritual temple, a "My Father's house?" And by "My Father's house" did Jesus mean a place or a spiritual condition of truth? Since we mortals cannot run just helter-skelter, since we cannot achieve an ubiquitous geographical freedom, but *when* we worship must also be on some *where*, in some *place*, the problem remains for us intensely practical. I wonder if the central problem posed in our assignment is not that of making a physical church a spiritual temple? Shall we not say that unless above itself it can erect itself, how poor a thing is the church? How can we bend a vast institution across those transcendent spiritual reaches which Jesus had in mind as he talked to the woman of Samaria? For we men must yet live largely in place and in time. If we do not worship on this hill in Samaria or on that hill in Jerusalem, we shall yet be somewhere. Since we cannot leap helter-skelter, since we cannot achieve a floating, ubiquitous freedom, I suppose at least we shall have to accept the practical alternative which Jesus accepted, namely, that of cleansing the temple, making our "Father's house" a place of worship. Perhaps, if we examine three major phases of worship common to the student mind, we shall be set better to handle this transcendent

and yet practical problem. Let us call these phases the Natural, the Human, and the Divine.

The Natural

There is, I think, in most healthy young people a joy-in-nature state. This state, at first undisciplined, almost atavistic, grows forward from its early delight in natural beauty to a more mature inquiry into scientific truth. And then, if the mind is not locked by the intense egotism of certain quasi-scientific truth, to the moral goodness of Life. Beauty, truth, goodness—the triune values—these inhere in the Natural. And in the natural they “trip off,” superinduce, excite a state of worship in profoundly significant ways.

The suggestiveness in this stratum of our thinking is enormous. Worship, here, becomes the synthetic force in a great part of our educational program. And the church, I think, is becoming more and more ready to release this force. In the department of nature beauty she anciently bears the aegis. Her psalms ring with some of the mightiest music of nature. Her Lord reveals the Infinite through the sparrow, the lily, the grass, the wind, and the lamb, as no other poet has done.

In the department of nature truth the church is not so ready. Yet her finest minds have been quick to appreciate the work of the scientist from the days of Aristotle and Copernicus and Newton to these wonder-times of Millikan and Steinmetz and Edison. And in the department of nature goodness she rises again to her own, and claims Lister and Pasteur and Osler as her children indeed.

The suggestiveness in this stratum of our thinking is enormous. Worship, here, becomes the synthetic force drawing together the chaotic particles of our educational program. It is the galvanic urge which holds in system the starry dust of science and philosophy. Without this humble and interpretative power, a college graduate becomes potentially like an Othello without love—a creature of chaos, a mechanism. (Parenthetically, it is in this division of the natural or scientific that the college is dominant and the church is adjunct. Until the college becomes normal, recognizing the whole of man, the church

especially must carry into the educational program those interpretations of the beautiful, the true, and the good in nature which will bring students into that whole understanding which we call worship.)

The Human

As the modern student experiences worship he finds himself also deeply set in a love-of-man state. He will tell you, perhaps, that the only real way in which a man can worship God is through helping some fellow man. And here worship takes on strongly for him the name of action. He is no Hamlet. He is not one who cries "Lord! Lord!" but one who does the will of the Father. He is—may we say it?—like Jesus in insisting upon action, upon the deed. And he feels intensely that he is worshipping when he is doing something beautiful or true or good. He is no young Sir Launfal. To extend a cup of cold water to one of the least of the little ones seems to him to be extending it to Christ himself. He is at times intensely practical. Such stories as that of the Good Samaritan he takes with a fierce literalness which astonishes us more accustomed Christians. When the modern student is not bound too fast by the decently-deadly imitation of his American elders, he is good material out of which a church can build the kingdom of heaven on earth.

The Divine

Just as worship is heart-central to a student's finding his right relationship with nature, or science, and also his true relationship with his fellowman, so worship is heart-central to his achieving an intimacy with God. Whether one considers worship from the scientific or the social or the exactly religious standpoint, its place is at the very heart of any adequate program.

But it is in this phase of worship which we call the divine—shall we call it the prayer-state?—that the attitude of the student is most significant. Here the student most naturally accepts Jesus' way. He is delighted to learn that Jesus was a lover of nature; and he is deeply charmed by the immediate efficacy of Jesus at work. But when Jesus goes apart to pray, establishing an intense aloneness with God, and when Jesus urges the

divinely sweet intimacies of the closet and the secret place, then I feel that the student understands the Teacher most clearly. Silent prayer, or prayer so sincere that its very articulation is swept with silence, that sort of prayer is student prayer. Of course, I speak of the student somewhat potentially here. I do not mean to suggest that our campuses are great "prayeries" where the sweet hush of communion "reigns supreme." But what I do mean is that because the modern campus is so over-activated, so Americanized, until its poor denizens suffer from a thousand toxic qualities, worship is a state of living sensitiveness to God. At its best, it is acutely personal and perhaps remains personal even though three are gathered together. However, either on some fortuitous chance or on the basic fact of the commonality of souls, worship may interfuse assemblies. Worship is loyalty to God. Worship is a state of being legal. It absorbs the human soul that is in earnest about real values. Worship, springing out of health, is the pure source of emotion, the strong source of intellect, the rapturous urge within the swiftest flight of the spirit. Worship is the erecting of the self above the self; it is the lifting not only of the eyes but of the entire being unto the hills from whence cometh strength. Worship is the "flight of the lonely soul to the Alone." Worship is the attempting, the failing, or the accomplishing of a fine task. Worship is locking God into the heart. And rising to intense ecstasy and noble experience, worship is the condition of being utterly broken before God. It is the ultimate releasing in flight toward God of the good, the true, the beautiful in the self. Or, conversely, it is the opening wide of the whole self to the Imminence of the Eternal. It is each soul's Immaculate Conception.

So defined, worship—I repeat it—is the core of any normal educational program. It is closer than breathing and nearer than hands and feet to the whole matter of education. Neglected or lost out of education, it leaves education either dead or a deadly force behaving wildly in dangerous mechanisms.

There remains the practical question of how the college church can in its special way induce worship. I think we all feel keenly the difficulty of producing a spiritual effect by means of a physi-

cal institution or the forms of that institution. And I believe we all would agree to throw away any forms that did not really induce worship, and to develop any of the forms which did. But it is not so easy to be sure which is which.

May I offer now a specific program? The service is a pre-Christmas service. The birth of Christ in the hearts of their near fellows seems to the students more vital than the celebration of an historical event. They decide to build their service toward that end. Prayer, then, must be the great thing. First, they write down the theme of the prayer: The birth in the hearts of men of the Christ. About the prayer they mould the rest of the service. The finest organ music, the best voices, and lights low or turned exclusively upon their great cross of natural wood—these things must precede the prayer. And after it—what? Jesus—His own words. No sermon, no “preaching”—Jesus—His beatitudes. There must be four college men and four college women—one for each beatitude; and someone to sum up the meaning of the holiness of Jesus’ words. Then let the organ close, and the people stand silent a moment and go silently.

So the service was worked out. It fed people.

And I believe that through quiet lighting and music, through simple exposition, through the reading of what Jesus said, *through simple pageantry*, through silence, and through prayer a service of worship can be built. It can be built to satisfy the hunger of youth for the real values in the Natural, the Human, and the Divine. It can leave for him at last a synthesis of those values which will escape beyond the mere values themselves and ultimately become an experience of God.

DISCUSSION

Question: What kind of worship is there in your morning service?

WEAVER: First, there is the call to worship. After that, there is the singing of hymns, Scripture reading, choir music, the collection is then taken, then more music, then the prayer, another hymn and then the sermon, and then a closing hymn. The sermon is a thing that has a great deal of sincerity in it.

Question: How long is the service?

WEAVER: From ten-thirty to a quarter of twelve.

Question: Are the prayers extemporaneous? Do you use old prayers in church?

McCUNE: Well, I am afraid some of them are sometimes old. Some of the best things we have are old. I usually prepare my prayers in advance. I very seldom read the prayers. We begin our prayers with one minute of silence. That is a very effective introduction. You can hear the proverbial pin drop. That part of the service is good. My part of the service usually lasts about three, never more than four minutes.

I think that one of the sins for which preachers will be condemned to a long stay in purgatory is the long prayer. Then, we almost invariably have the Lord's Prayer. We are always sure that two parts of the service will be good; the first, the silent prayer, and then the Lord's Prayer.

Question: May I ask a question? In your evaluating of worship and your building up of worship programs for the students, do you help them in evaluating?

WEAVER: What I found when I was in Oxford is that the student mind is going back, back, back, and in Oxford it has gone back into Catholicism, because they feel they need what the ritualistic service will give them. Something similar to this happened to some of our students. They wanted a cross so I went out and cut them a cherry tree and had our college carpenter make it into a cross, natural size. They wanted to make the cross the real thing that it is in the service. They are making it the real symbol of their religion, banking it with flowers, etc., and make it the chief symbol of the service.

Question: In one of the churches in Nebraska, the interest and participation of the young people is carried on because of a certain attraction. The pastor is quite likely to have two of the young people in the pulpit with him. The young people in the body of the audience who have been at a previous service of their own are interested in seeing their friends in the pulpit remain there.

Then there is another church in which the matter of the offering has been redeemed from commercialism as well as I have seen it done anywhere.

That is, when the ushers bring the offering forward, after it has been gathered, the congregation rises and sings, "Praise God from Whom All Blessings Flow."

Question: Do your students have any active part in planning these services or carrying out the services?

WEAVER: The services are executed by the students as much as possible.

Question: How did you go about getting the students to work out these services?

WEAVER: We carefully studied incoming classes a year ago. We then picked out students who seemed superior and spiritual. Then, the next year, I asked them to come up to the house and we sat down before the fireplace and talked about how are we going to get away from the distraction of the

campus. They said we will build up a worship program and will work it out if you will let us. Of course, we were glad to let them.

Question: Do you have a student meeting Sunday evening and also a separate worship service?

WEAVER: We have one hour before they pass into the evening service. That hour is one with as much variety as we can put into it. The social part comes in rather strongly. It does not conflict, but rather supplements the evening service.

Question: I am wondering, in these meetings you have on Sunday, is it the same group of students who come in the morning as in the evening?

WEAVER: Some students will come more than they ought to. I have urged some of them to keep away from church. I don't want them to come to church three times on Sunday. I would rather they would take a walk along a lonely road and think things out for themselves.

From the group: I have recently been reading Albert Schweitzer a great deal, and I think that what we have been discussing here is what he talked about as "reverence for life." If we can get an attitude of reverence, reverence toward each other, a very natural reverence toward God would then result, and in that line comes the very idea of our religious education.

A little over a year ago we had a group of students connected with our church who decided that they wanted to branch out. They said, "Why do people sing songs?" "They do it to stir up their emotions." They said, "Let us get away from singing." "Why do people pray?" "It is another way of getting an emotional response." They said "Let us do away with prayers." "We are going to be seekers after truth."

Several students came to me about this and I said, "Let us not throw away our music and our prayers until we see how they are getting along." They investigated, came back, and said, "We must have more music and better music; we must have more praying and better praying."

Question: Are we seeing the educational significance of this very striking thing that Weaver has been presenting to us? The analogy I have been thinking of is the state of the drama with its movies and professional plays. Mr. Weaver hasn't said to us that our services have gotten so rutty and so regularized that nobody has been thinking very much about student creativity and the connection with it, but I wonder if that isn't what he has been implying. Maybe there is something here which is analogous in its power to re-create the way in which creative work in the drama has been catching the imagination of students. "This stuff is ours," say the students in many of those dramatic groups and we have found in our study of that thing in a number of colleges some of the finest ethical and moral results, because the students were doing it themselves.

WEAVER: I would imply everything that you implied.

THOMAS S. EVANS GOES TO CALIFORNIA

O. D. FOSTER

The many friends of Mr. Thomas S. Evans will be interested to learn that he has accepted a call to become the Executive Secretary of the University Religious Council of the new University of California to be built at Los Angeles. As previously stated in these columns* this Council is composed of an equal number of representatives of five general interests and points of view: Catholic, Jewish, Protestant, University and At Large. This all inclusive Council will safeguard the interests of all groups.

Mr. Evans, in accepting this call, is launching on uncharted seas, but not without the compass of a rich experience and a conquering faith. Though this pioneering enterprise is fraught with numerous trials and perplexities and will tax the ingenuity of even the wealth of experience and good judgment of Mr. Evans, his many friends believe in him as a leader and will lend to him their most genuine and sympathetic support. Only the very magnitude of this challenge could have induced Mr. Evans to lay down the exceptionally important work he has been doing with the International Council of Religious Education. While the churches will feel keenly the loss of Mr. Evans in the International Council, they will be grateful that he has returned to his old love—the university field.

For any of us to expect that Mr. Evans or any other human being, can fill such a position without making mistakes, will be to show our own ignorance of what is involved in this unprecedented challenge and complicated situation. The more we understand the number of delicate angles and problems, the deeper our sympathies and the more earnest our prayers will be that the wisdom of the University Religious Council may be vindicated in its selection of Mr. Evans to be its first executive.

The University Religious Council is composed of an unusually high class of broadminded and farseeing men and women, each

* CHRISTIAN EDUCATION, Feb., 1927, page 275. *Ibid.*, Jan., 1928, pages 263 and 264.

of whom will constantly seek for all others a square deal. With this unique combination of interests, represented by such competent individuals, we bespeak for Mr. Evans a delightful fellowship and a far-reaching service. But remembering all the time the difficulties of the problems to be solved, may our inclinations to criticize be early converted into the spirit to sympathize. The task is so great and the needs so stupendous, that every one interested in the floods of young people that will sweep through this great center, will lend to Mr. Evans and his worthy colleagues loyal help, good wishes and prayers for their success in this most prophetic adventure in understanding in religious life and education of students in the entire country.

May the common Father of Catholic, Jew and Protestant bless this pioneering effort in behalf of His children and of His Kingdom.

AS MODERN WRITERS SEE JESUS

Miss Adelaide T. Case, of Teachers College, has brought together a series of remarkable statements in her little volume bearing the above title. She remarks that Jesus' own originality and power are in no way lessened by the insistence that he was a true son of Israel, and quotes the following significant words of Rabbi Hyman G. Enelow:

Among the great and the good that the human race has produced, none has ever approached Jesus in universality of appeal and sway. He has become the most fascinating figure in history. In him is combined what is best and most enchanting in Israel—the eternal people whose child he was. The Jew cannot help glorying in what Jesus thus has meant to the world; nor can he help hoping that Jesus may yet serve as a bond of union between Jew and Christian, once his teaching is better known and the bane of misunderstanding is at last removed from his words and his ideal.

**REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON CORRELATION OF
BIBLE STUDY IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS
AND COLLEGES, NATIONAL ASSOCIA-
TION OF BIBLICAL INSTRUCTORS***

The report of last December embodying a curriculum of secondary schools was printed in the May issue of CHRISTIAN EDUCATION. Since there was not time to consider it fully at the meeting, it was sent to each member of the Association asking for criticisms. A goodly number of replies were received, many more from the colleges than from the secondary schools. The large majority approved on the whole, with some very constructive criticisms. There was a general complaint that it covered too much ground, quite impossible to teach well in the time allotted. There was a very just criticism of the disproportionate amount of material on the Old Testament compared with the New. The material on the Life of Jesus and the Life of Paul had been taken from the first outline published in 1919 under the leadership of Dr. Kent and was not arranged logically with the Old Testament scheme adopted. Too much memory work and map work was included.

Therefore after receiving all the criticisms and suggestions your committee met again last fall, going over the work very carefully in detail and portioning out sections to various members for better results.

We submit to you a revised outline with options as to parts to be taken to satisfy the unit of entrance credit to college. In this connection the bibliography published in the November CHRISTIAN EDUCATION should be of use. We hope for a final adoption at this meeting, as secondary schools are asking for authoritative copies to be used in their college preparatory classes.

Respectfully submitted,

MAUDE LOUISE STRAYER,

ROBERT L. KELLY,

ROBERT SENECA SMITH,

LAURA H. WILD, *Chairman.*

December 28, 1927

* The Association voted to adopt the course as now revised and printed, and ordered it published in pamphlet form together with the bibliography.

**COURSE OF STUDY FOR SECONDARY SCHOOLS
OFFERING A UNIT OF BIBLE FOR
COLLEGE ENTRANCE**

*Prepared by the Committee on Correlation of Bible Work in
Secondary Schools and Colleges of the National
Association of Biblical Instructors*

Aim

In general, to enable students to know the principal narratives and characters of the Bible in their historical and social settings. To understand and assimilate the thought and to feel the beauty and spiritual inspiration of the Biblical masterpieces.

I. Memory Work:

Required:

The Two Great Commandments—Deut. 6: 4, 5 and
Lev. 19: 18 b.

The Ten Commandments—Exodus 20: 1-17

The Twenty-third Psalm

The Beatitudes—Matt. 5: 3-12

The Thirteenth Chapter of I Corinthians

And, in addition, at least five of the following:

Psalms 1, or 19, or 91, or 121

Portions* of Isaiah 40, or 53, or 55

Micah 6: 6-8

Portions* of Matt. 5, or 6, or 7

“ “ John 14, or 15, or 16

“ “ Romans 8, 35-39, or Romans 12

Ephesians 3: 14-21

“ 6: 10-17

Philippians 3: 7-14

“ 4: 4-8

II. Outline of Old Testament Material:

(It is expected that the teachers will emphasize the narratives and characters rather than the mere historical outline.)

1. Patriarchal Period, ending about 1250 B. C.

* A “portion” equals ten verses.

Primitive religious customs and conditions of living.
The patriarchal figures and association of the patriarchs with certain localities:

Abraham, Hebron; Isaac, Beersheba; Jacob, Bethel.
Names and location of other tribes and nations of the time.

Location of Ur, Sodom, Mesopotamia.

2. Egyptian Sojourn, Exodus, and Wilderness Wanderings, about 1250-1150 B. C.

The Joseph Stories. Hebrew Slavery. The Plagues. The Passover. Forty Years in the Wilderness. The Ark of the Covenant. The Laws.

Moses, Aaron, Miriam, Rameses II.

Kadesh, Sinai, Red Sea, Edom.

3. Invasion and Settlement of Canaan, about 1150-1050 B. C.

The process by separate tribes. Dangers—religious, political, economic—confronting the invaders.

Joshua, Gideon, Jephthah, Samson, Barak, Deborah. Philistines, Canaanites.

Jericho, Jordan, Esdraelon, Shechem, Ebal, Gerizim.

4. Origin and Development of the Kingdom, about 1050-937 B. C. (Emphasis only on main characters and events.)

The two stories of the relations of Samuel and Saul. Character and work of Saul. Life of David. Capture of Jerusalem and unification of the kingdom. Solomon. Foreign influence. The temple. Economic changes.

Eli, Jonathan, Absalom, Rehoboam.

Mizpah, Bethlehem, Jerusalem, Gaza, Gilboa.

5. The Two Hebrew Kingdoms, 937-586 B. C. (Main characters and events.)

Rebellion. Rivalry of the two kingdoms. Emergence of the great prophets. Literary activity. Rise of House of Omri. Elijah and the danger from foreign influences. Social conditions under Jeroboam II. Amos and the place of morality in religion. Hosea and the place of love in religion. Isaiah's work. The Assyrian threat. Jeremiah's personality. Deuteronomy.

Jeroboam I, Ahab, Jezebel, Jehu, Joshua, Elisha, Micah.

Samaria, Jezreel, Carmel, Megiddo, Tekoa, Anathoth.

6. The Exile, 586-538 B. C.

Religious and economic readjustments. Increased legalistic interest. Synagogue.

Deutero-Isaiah.

Nebuchadnezzar, Ezekiel.

Babylon. Deutero-Isaiah and the place of suffering in religion.

7. The Persian Period, 538-332 B. C.

Return. The second temple.

Cyrus, Haggai, Zechariah, Zerubbabel, Nehemiah, Ezra, Ruth, Jonah.

8. Greek and Maccabean Period, 332-63 B. C.

Alexander, Ptolemies, Antiochus IV, Judas Maccabaeus, Daniel.

Antioch, Alexandria, Macedonia.

III. *Outline of New Testament Material:*

1. Roman Period (63 B. C.-70 A. D.) Development of World Empire. Jewish Thought

2. Life and Teachings of Jesus

a. Early life. Education. Preparation

b. Ministry of John the Baptist

c. Call and Wilderness Temptations

d. Galilean Ministry

(1) Early period of popularity. Companions

(2) Methods of ministry

(3) Message

(4) Growing opposition

(5) Crisis

e. Period of retirement

f. Final advance (Perean ministry)

g. Passion Week.

3. The Beginnings of the Christian Movement.

a. Effect of Resurrection

b. Early Community. Pentecost, Peter.

c. Conflict. Stephen.

d. Widening Field. Philip, Cornelius, Antioch.

4. Life and Work of Paul.

a. Early life in Tarsus.

b. Student days in Jerusalem.

c. Paul persecutes the Church.

d. His conversion to Christianity.

e. His early work as a missionary.

- f. Christianity in its final break with Judaism.
- g. The first Christian churches in Europe.
- h. The churches in Corinth and Ephesus.
- i. Paul's arrest and trials at Jerusalem and Caesarea.
- j. His last work as a Roman prisoner.
- k. A brief survey of Paul's service to Christian thought in his letters, especially in his letter to the Romans.

IV. *Use of Maps.* (Those starred represent the minimum):

A. **Old Testament**

- 1.* a. The Ancient World of Hebrews, before 1250 B. C. Locate peoples of that date. Locate Ur, Haran, Mesopotamia, Canaan, principal rivers, fertile crescent, desert.
- b. Ancient world showing early migrations of Babylonians, Phoenicians, Canaanites, Philistines and Hebrews.
- 2. Problem—To show the probable route of the Exodus, the points of interest on the journey from Egypt to Canaan.
- 3. a. Show the topographical features of Palestine, mountains and rivers.
- b. Show the tribes before the attacks and general line of attack of the "wars of the oppression."
- c. Show final location of tribes and neighboring peoples, 1100-1050 B. C.
- d. Battle of Kishon.
- 4. a. Extent of Saul's Kingdom.
- b. David's problems at the beginning of his reign. (Battle of Mt. Gilboa.)
- c. Hebrew world of David's time. Indicate significance to Hebrews.
- 5.* a. Show the limits of the two kingdoms.
- b. Identify localities connected with Elijah.
- c. Syrian domination of the Hebrews.
- d. On several maps show the course of the Assyrian waves of invasion, indicating the effect of each. Name all the leaders involved.
- e. Period of Israel's prosperity.
- f. Break-up of the Assyrian Empire and Egyptian domination of the Hebrews. (612-605 B. C.)

6. Show location of Jewish colonies in Babylonia and Egypt, 586 B. C.
7. a. Persian Empire, showing size of Jewish colony at first return.
b. Palestine in the time of Nehemiah. Locate Jerusalem and Samaria.
8. a. Syrian Conquest of 198 B. C., showing Ptolemies and Seleucids.
b. Maccabean Kingdom (divisions—Galilee, Samaria, Judea.)

B. New Testament

1. Kingdom of Herod.
Roman Empire in the time of Augustus (no outline map of this).
 - *2. Palestine in the time of Christ. Locate principal places visited, mountains, rivers, divisions.
 3. Spread of gospel before Paul.
 - *4. Journeys of Paul (one or four maps as desired).
- N. B. By putting these maps in a row on a bulletin board in chronological order the course of Hebrew history can be traced. The student by this means gets perspective and is enabled through visual perception to have events fixed in the mind. It is excellent for review.†

V. Readings in Bible:

A. Old Testament

Genesis

1, 2, 3	Creation
4: 1-15	Cain and Abel
6, 7, 8	Noah
9: 1-17	Rainbow
11: 1-9	Babel
12: 1-9	} Abraham
13, 18	
19: 1-28	
21: 1-21	
22: 1-19	

† For younger students relief maps may be useful. An outline map may be drawn on stiff wallboard or cardboard. Two tablespoonfuls of flour and one of salt are enough for one map five by eight inches. Comparative elevations of seas, mountains, and plains taken from a geography of the land may be represented and when the paste has stiffened the map may be tinted with water colors to show fertility.

24	Rebekah
27: 1-45	Isaac's blessing
28: 10-29: 30	} Jacob
35: 1-15	
37: 39-45	
	Joseph
Exodus	
1	Oppression
2	Birth of Moses
3	Bush
4	Moses' humility, etc.
5	Interview with Pharaoh
10, 11, 12: 1-14	Plagues
14	Red Sea
15: 19-25	Miriam's Song
19	Sinai
20: 1-21	Decalogue
Deuteronomy	
6: 4-9	Moses' Sermon
Joshua	
1-6	Jericho
Judges	
5	Deborah
6: 7-7: 23	Gideon
11: 1-40	Jephthah
14-16 (31 verses) or 16	Samson
Ruth	
1-4	
I Samuel	
1	Birth of Samuel
2: 18-26; 3	Call of Samuel
9: 1-10: 16	Choice of Saul
28: 3-25	Witch of Endor
II Samuel	
1	David's lament
6	The Ark
11-12: 25	Bathsheba and Nathan
15: 1-6; 18	Absalom's rebellion

I Kings

- | | |
|-----------------------|------------------|
| 3: 4-15 | Solomon's choice |
| 10: 1-13 | Queen of Sheba |
| 12: 1-11 | Rehoboam |
| 16: 29-19: 21, or 17, | Ahab and Elijah |
| 18 (70 verses) | Elijah |
| 21 | Naboth |

II Kings

- | | |
|--------------|------------------------|
| 2: 1-14 | Elijah's ascension |
| 4: 8-37; 5 | Elisha |
| 9 | Jehu's revolt |
| 18: 13-19: 8 | Sennacherib's invasion |
| 22: 1-23: 3 | Josiah's reform |

Ezra 10: 1-17

Nehemiah 1, 2, 4: 1-7: 4

Proverbs 8: 1-11; 9: 10; 22: 1, 2

Isaiah 1: 1-20; 6: 1-12; 9: 2-7; 11: 1-9; 40; 42: 1-4;

43: 1, 2; 52: 13-53: 12; 55; 61

Jeremiah 1, 18, 26, 28, 36, 37, 38

Ezekiel 18: 1-4; 33: 1-9; 34; 37: 1-14

Daniel 1, 3, 5, 6

Hosea 14

Amos 5: 21-24

Micah 4: 1-7; 6: 1-8

Jonah 1-4

Haggai 1, 2

B. New Testament

1. *Jesus.* (See Outline III, 2)

a. Mt. 2; Lu. 1; 2; Mk. 1: 9; 6: 3; Lu. 4: 16; Mt. 7: 11, 24-29; Mt. 13: 33, 55, 56; Lu. 11: 7; 15: 8

b. Mk. 1: 1-8; Lu. 3: 1-20

c. Mk. 1: 9-13; Mt. 4: 1-11; Lu. 4: 1-13

d. (1) and (2) Mk. 1: 14-45; 3: 7-21; 4: 1, 35-41; 5: 1-43; 6: 3-6; Mt. 4: 23-25; 8: 5-13; 9: 35-11: 30;

(3) Mt. 5; 6; 7; 13; 22: 37-40; 23; 25: 1-46; Lu. 10: 25-37; 11: 1-13; 12: 13-21; 14: 1-33; 15: 1-32; 16: 19-31; 18: 9-14; Mk. 10: 13-16; 11: 22-26.

(4) and (5) Mk. 2: 1-28; 3: 1-6, 22-35; Lu. 4: 16-30; Mk. 6: 14-7: 23; Jn. 6: 15.

e. Mk. 7: 24-9: 32

- f. Lu. 9: 51-62; 10: 38-42; 17: 11-19; 18: 18-19; 10: Mk. 10: 35-45
- g. Mk. 11: 1-11, 15-19, 27-33; 12: 13-44; 14: 1-15: 47; Lu. 23: 34-46; Jn. 19: 26-28.
Jn. 1: 4, 5, 16-18; 3: 16; 4: 21-26; 8: 3-12; 10: 10, 11, 16; 12: 24, 25, 32; 13: 1-17, 34, 35; 14: 15; 17

2. *Beginning of Christian Movement.* (See Outline III, 3)

- a. Mk. 16: 1-8; Mt. 28; Lu. 24; Jn. 20, 21; 1 Cor. 15: 1-8; Acts 1: 3
- b.-d. Acts 1: 4, 8-15, 23-26; 2: 1-21, 36-47; 3: 1-26; 4: 1-37; 5: 12-42; 6: 8-15; 7: 1-8; 3; 8: 4-8, 25-40; 9: 1, 2; 10: 1-48; 11: 1-26

3. *Life and Work of Paul.* (See Outline III, 4)

- a. Acts 18: 3; 21: 39; 22: 3, 27, 28; 23: 6, 16; 2 Cor. 11: 22; Phil. 3: 5
- b. Acts 5: 35-40; 22: 3
- c. Acts 7: 59-8: 3; 26: 1-11; Gal. 1: 13-14; Phil. 3: 6
- d. Acts 9: 1-19a; Gal. 1: 15-17
- e. Acts 9: 19-31; 13: 1-14: 28
- f. Acts 15: 1-35; Gal. 2, 5: 1-6: 16
- g. Acts 15: 36-17: 34
- h. Acts 18: 1-20: 38; 1 Cor. 1-6; 2 Cor. (parts)
- i. Acts 21: 15-26: 32
- j. Acts 27: 1-28: 31; Philemon; Philippians
- k. Romans 2-8; 12-15; 1 Cor. 13, 15; 2 Cor. 4: 7-18; 2 Cor. 11: 22-30; Gal. 3: 23-29; 5: 1; Eph. 3: 14-21; 6: 10-20; Phil. 2: 5-11; 3: 7-14; 4: 4-8

Options

Required: Part II. 4-8 (7 and 8 to be done briefly)

Part III. 1-2

Add either:

Part II. 1-3 or Part III. 3, 4

N. B. In connection with this outline the bibliography published in the November CHRISTIAN EDUCATION should prove helpful. Under the heading Geography, helps in map work may be found.

AMONG THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARIES

GARDINER M. DAY

Inter-Seminary Conference of the Middle Atlantic States

One hundred and twenty-three delegates from twenty-four theological seminaries gathered together at the General Theological Seminary for a three days' discussion conference, December 28-30, on the topic "Toward a more United Church."

The students included representatives of the Baptist, Congregational, Dutch and German Reformed, Lutheran, Methodist, Presbyterian, Universalist and Protestant Episcopal Churches.

An exceptionally fine group of speakers were gathered together through the efforts of Mr. Grant Noble, the chairman of the Inter-Seminary Movement in the Middle Atlantic States; Chaplin R. Ambrose, Secretary of the Theological College Department of the Student Christian Movement of Great Britain and Ireland; Dean F. E. W. Fosbrooke, of the General Theological Seminary, and others interested in church unity. Starting with the consideration of the present obstacles to church unity, the conference went on to discussion of the ways and means of actual cooperation which can be carried out in our church life to-day.

The difficulties that face the establishment of a united church were pointed out by the Reverend M. G. Scherer for the Lutherans; by the Reverend Leonard Hodgson for the Episcopalians; and by the Reverend Eugene W. Lyman for the other denominations. Professor Hodgson voiced the difficulties felt by the Episcopal Church concisely and clearly. Although in insisting on the three-fold orders of the Church as essential to union, nevertheless, he declared that continuity with the very early date at which the three-fold ministry was established was as necessary as earnest continuity of belief and practice to secure vital unity. A keen discussion followed these talks in which the various phases of the whole problem were considered. Probably the two most impressive speeches of the whole conference were made by Dr. William Adams Brown, of the Union Theological Seminary, and Bishop Francis J. McConnell. Dr. Brown traced the history and growth of the movement toward church unity during the

past several decades and called upon all the members of the conference to see to it that in their ministry they manifest the finest spirit of cooperation and unity. Bishop McConnell spoke to the topic "The Churches and Industry." He spoke of his absolute conviction that it was the right and duty of the church to exercise authority in safe-guarding the human, intellectual and spiritual values in all phases of life, and especially when these values were endangered by a pagan industrial system. In a report of the conference in *The Churchman* Mr. Lawrence Rose writes as follows:

One of the strongest sentiments that arose out of the discussion groups was the feeling of immense value of just such ventures as this conference. Some few went away overwhelmed by the hopelessness of efforts toward unity, and with the feeling that without such hope conferences are futile; but by such a majority as to make the sentiment all but unanimous was felt the effectiveness of the conference in removing suspicion, fostering the spirit of fellowship and mutual respect in recognition of one another's consecration to the work of our Lord, and in promotion of the will to unity. Such an honest feeling is the best possible witness to the success of the conference.

Advance Notices

An Inter-Seminary Conference for the Theological Schools of the South will be held at Vanderbilt School of Religion in Nashville, Tennessee, from April 9-20. The chairman of the conference will be E. R. Walker, of Vanderbilt School of Religion. The conference will be held at the same time as the Rural Church Institute. Speakers for the Institute, who very likely will participate in this conference also, are Dr. Vogt, Dr. Alva Taylor, Dr. Ashby Jones and Dr. S. Parkes Cadman.

An Inter-Seminary Conference for the Central States is being planned for April 23-25, in the Oberlin Theological School of Oberlin, Ohio. The chairman of this conference is R. J. Striffler, of Oberlin, and the leading speaker will be Canon B. H. Streeter, of Oxford.

Under the guidance of the students of the local council and through the cooperation of the various churches, the students of Boston are holding three student services, at which the addresses will be on the topic, "What Difference Does Religion Make?" At the first service on February 26, held in Trinity Church, the speaker was President Henry Sloane Coffin, of the Union Theological Seminary; at the second service, held in First Baptist Church, the speaker will be the Reverend H. P. VanDusen; at the third service in Mt. Vernon Congregational Church, the speaker will be Mr. Stanley High.

The New England Student Department of the Y. M. C. A. announces that the Northfield Summer Conference will be held next June 15-23. The following speakers have already been secured: Henry Sloane Coffin, Kirby Page, Reinhold Niebuhr, Charles Corbett, H. P. VanDusen, Sidney Lovett. Mr. Lovett will be in charge of the consideration and Mr. VanDusen of the paper study. In addition there will be the following interest groups: (1) Industrial Problems; (2) International or Racial Problems; (3) Social Relations (Men and Women; Family, etc.); (4) Comparative Religions; (5) Problems of Belief; (6) The Church (at Home and in Mission Fields); (7) Education (?); (8) Politics (?) (if situation next June makes it apropos).

The new million-dollar group of buildings of the Chicago Theological Seminary will be dedicated during the eight-day celebration, June 3-10, when the Seminary's twenty-fourth triennial convention will be held. A striking program is being arranged.

THE PLACE OF RELIGION IN GENERAL EDUCATION*

FATHER J. ELLIOTT ROSS,

Director, Newman Hall, and Catholic Advisor,
Columbia University

A generation ago, the old family physician treated his patient's ailment as an isolated fact. He looked at his tongue, felt his pulse, listened to his heart and lungs, took his temperature, and that was about the extent of his diagnosis. If the man had typhoid or pneumonia or tuberculosis at the moment, that was all the doctor wanted to know.

But today, a good physician is much more inquisitive. He wants to know the whole life history of a patient; and if possible, the life history of his parents, too. A doctor who is worth his salt is not satisfied with determining what is wrong just now, but he tries to find out how this condition arose. For he knows that the ultimate outcome will differ because of previous illnesses or inherited weaknesses.

If that is true of the individual, it is much more true of a social condition. No situation is ever really completely isolated. And, therefore, to understand any particular state of affairs, we ought to know the history leading up to it. Moreover, if we are going to prescribe wisely for it, we ought not to be satisfied with our comparatively narrow experience. We ought to know how similar situations have been met among ourselves in times past, and in other countries contemporaneously.

We cannot, therefore, understand the present situation in regard to the state and religion in the schools in the United States, without knowing the life history of that relationship in past generations; and we cannot come to a wise decision as to policy without knowing also what other countries are doing about this same problem of the relation of the state to religion in the schools.

* Paper read before the National Conference of Catholic, Jewish, and Protestant Religious Workers in Non-Sectarian Institutions of Higher Learning, University of Iowa, January 2, 1928.

The present generation of Americans has grown up accustomed to the idea that there should be no religion in the state schools, and that no religious schools should in any way receive state aid. Indeed, this divorce of religion and the schools has been insisted upon so emphatically as essentially American that large numbers of people have come to look upon any other situation as in some way un-American. They are like the old-fashioned doctor who took his patient's illness as an isolated fact.

The problem is: What attitude should the state take toward religion in the schools?

Just now the great majority in this country are taking the attitude that the state should be so completely divorced from religion in education, that there should be no teaching of religion in state schools; and there should be no appropriation of state funds for the support of other schools in which religion is taught.

But we ought to use our influence to get as many as possible of our fellow citizens to ask themselves how long this attitude has dominated our policy; how it came about; is it the best possible attitude; is it so rigorously demanded by the logic of the situation that we always had it, and that other nations facing essentially similar situations have naturally adopted the same attitude?

In answering these questions, I think the first point to emphasize is that the present attitude in this country is of comparatively recent origin. We are in the second phase of our policy in regard to the relations between the state and the teaching of religion in the schools. So little is today's solution of the problem demanded by the elements of the situation that it goes back hardly more than a generation; and other nations, equally advanced educationally and politically, have reached a different solution. Moreover, so little is this solution essential, that there are indications of the temporariness of the present situation as regards the future, as well as regards the past.

A little historical knowledge will dispel the idea that the present complete divorce between the state and the teaching of religion is essential to Americanism. And while, of course, we have that knowledge, it is well to review it, and to insist upon it, and to be prepared to insist upon it with others who have never

known it, or who have lost sight of it. This, then, is my excuse for recalling to your minds certain facts in the history of American education.

Originally, all the schools in this country taught religion. And as a consequence, all the men who built up the colonies, and who afterwards formed this Republic, were educated in schools teaching religion. That was the first phase of the relation between the state and religion in the schools. It would certainly be a little presumptuous for the present generation of Americans to convict our ancestors wholesale of being un-American because of this religious element in their education.

Conditions have changed now, but the change is not very old. We may say that the second phase of American schools—the present system of eliminating religion from the state schools, and of giving no subsidies to any schools teaching religion—did not get universally established until after the Civil War. Not only, then, were the colonies built, and the Revolution fought, and the Constitution adopted by men educated in schools teaching religion,—the country passed through its whole formative period under such leaders. Washington, Jefferson, Monroe, Jackson, Lincoln had all made their contributions to our national life before the present system wishing to claim exclusive title to the name “American” had become firmly established.

If we go back to colonial days, we find that everywhere the schools taught religion. As Cubberly says in his *History of Education* (p. 521,) “The school everywhere in America arose as the child of the church.” In fact, it was only in New England that the state may be said to have had schools. And even the town or state schools in New England taught religion. The civil population and the church population were the same, and though the school was technically under the civil government, everyone considered it was only natural that the school should reinforce the teaching of the church. Loyalty to the church was looked upon as identical with loyalty to the state. If the schools had not taught religion, the citizens would have considered this tantamount to failing to teach patriotism.

In New York the situation was somewhat different. There were no state schools in a strict sense. A public school society con-

ducted schools, and received state aid, but the schools were private. Religion was taught. And as long as the citizens were fairly homogeneous religiously, no one thought of questioning this.

Pennsylvania had no state schools, and gave no subsidy to private schools. Education was looked upon as a function of the church. Any religious group was free to have its own schools, and naturally taught its own concept of religion.

Neither did the Southern colonies have state schools. In some of them church and state were united, but it was the church that assumed the responsibility of education. And since the church conducted the schools, the schools taught religion.

But as civilization became more complex, the state took on more functions. At the same time, the population became more and more heterogeneous religiously, while many gave up all church affiliation. It was inevitable, therefore, that the state should enter the field of education more and more universally, and to a greater and greater extent.

The American doctrine of separation of church and state led on naturally, perhaps, to the unchurched groups objecting to any state moneys being used for what seemed to be a teaching of religion. In the thirties and forties of the last century a very bitter fight was well under way to prevent the subsidizing by the state of denominationally controlled schools, and by the seventies and eighties this movement had been practically successful. Here and there state money was appropriated for religious eleemosynary institutions, such as orphan asylums, but generally speaking a complete elimination of religion from the schools had been accomplished as far as the state was concerned. The second phase of our American school system was accomplished.

The unchurched groups, however, could not have won out in this movement to secularize the schools, if it had not been for the help of many ¹¹church people. Unfortunately, the churches were divided among themselves, and they played a dog-in-the-manger policy. Today, however, they seem to be beginning to see their mistake. There are many indications that we are approaching a third phase of American education, when some method will

be devised whereby religion will be taught to the children in the state schools.

I have said that I do not think the logic on which this agitation to prevent all state appropriations for religious schools was based, was entirely sound, and I should like to make this clear. For it is not necessarily subsidizing religion to subsidize a school in which religion is taught. The subsidy may be for teaching profane subjects, and the teaching of religion may be entirely at the expense of the church interested in the school. If it costs the state \$60 a year to educate a child in its own schools, and a particular church is willing to give an equivalent profane education for \$50 a year, it is hard to see how this saving to the state of \$10 a year for each child in the religious school can be called subsidizing the teaching of religion.

As a matter of fact, this distinction was seen well enough here in America in regard to charitable institutions; and the governments of some other countries have seen it in regard to all schools. And they have seen it even in countries where church and state are united, and where, therefore, there might be expected a greater opposition to the state seeming in any way to provide for the teaching of a church that was not united to the state.

In England, for instance, the Anglican Church is established by law and united with the state. Its bishops and ministers are state officials paid by the state. All its churches and other buildings are state property. Nevertheless, any religious denomination—within certain limits—can build its own schools, called "voluntary schools, and the owners of these [voluntary] schools nominate two-thirds of the managing body. This body has the sole right to appoint teachers, and it controls the religious instruction, subject to a provision that pupils of other denominations may be excused from such instruction at the request of their parents." (*Educational Yearbook*, 1925, p. 112.)

Of course, the voluntary school is subject to state supervision, and its teachers must have the qualifications demanded by the state. The state sees to it that the profane education given in the voluntary school is in every way as good as that given in the state schools, and it pays for that in proportion to the number of

pupils. The mere fact that the school is, in addition, free to teach religion does not mean that the state is paying for such religious teaching. In fact, this is a good bargain for the state, since it is spared the original cost of the building.

A similar arrangement prevails in Scotland, except that the state has recently undertaken to buy the religious school buildings. And in the future, I suppose it will pay for whatever buildings are needed for the different religious groups.

Holland has tried out a complete divorce of the state and religious education, such as we have had in this country, and now it is returning to a different system. The Calvinists and the Catholics asked equal rights for their schools, on the plea that it was unjust to compel them to pay taxes for the state schools, to which they objected on religious grounds, and at the same time support schools of their own. This principle of recognizing equal right to support from the state for religious as well as for state schools finally won out. And the writer, in *The Education Year-book* (1925) says:

The trend of our politics is certainly in favor of the non-public, sectarian school. On the whole, the public school is losing ground; there is a strong movement to make all elementary schools non-public, the state only to furnish the necessary money for their support, without interfering with the teaching. (p. 208.)

Monroe's *Cyclopedia of Education*, describing the condition in Germany, says that while the public higher schools are almost wholly interdenominational or undenominational, "the lower schools are undenominational in only a few states." The law provided that

Public elementary schools are to be so organized that Protestant children receive their instruction from Protestant teachers, Catholic children from Catholic teachers.

When in any school community, which has only elementary schools staffed with Catholic teachers, the number of local Protestant children of school age for five consecutive years is over sixty, or in towns and rural communities of more than 5,000 inhabitants, over 120, then, provided that the legal representatives of more than sixty, or more than 120 children of school age of the class mentioned, make rec-

ommendations to the supervising educational authorities, instruction is to be arranged in schools wholly under Protestant teachers,

and vice versa. And this was true even before the war, when the state was united to the Lutheran Church.

In some of the provinces of Canada, the school tax is divided among the churches according to the religion of the payer. The taxes of Catholics go to the support of Catholic schools, the taxes of Protestants for Protestant schools.

Where church and state are united, as in Norway, Sweden, Denmark, it is only natural that religion should be taught in the state schools. The Catholic minority is so small that no provision has been made for them out of state funds.

Mussolini has recently put religion back into the state schools of Italy. And as far as I know, no provision is made there for the very small Protestant minority.

Unfortunately, there is no monograph, or yearbook, or encyclopedia of education, giving the relation between the state and the teaching of religion for the whole world. But from the brief survey I have just given, I think we can say that the United States and France are the only advanced nations refusing to allow state funds to be appropriated for religious schools. All the other powerful nations recognize so keenly the need of teaching religion, that some sort of provision is made out of state moneys. And at least two nations—Holland and Italy—that tried out our strict system of secular public education, have reversed themselves.

Now, I do not think that we shall ever in this country come to the adoption of any system corresponding to that in vogue in Germany and Holland; much less, of course, shall we adopt the system in operation in parts of Canada; and it is unthinkable that we should have the teaching of just one religion in the state schools, as in Norway and Sweden and Italy.

But I do think there is a trend on the part of educators and statesmen and civic leaders in the direction of recognizing the need of religion. Some day we are going to effect a compromise that will be satisfactory to all the religious groups whereby the

children in state schools will be taught religion. It may be by something like the Gary system; or the Faribault plan; or an extension of the plan now operating at the University of Iowa. But whatever it is, I think we can look forward confidently to a not distant day when it will sweep the country.

We have passed through one phase of education in this country when all schools taught religion, and the foundations of the nation were laid by men educated during that phase; we are now in a second phase where the state will have nothing whatever to do with the teaching of religion; but we may devoutly hope that this second phase will be no more permanent than the first, that it is in fact already passing, and that like almost all the other advanced nations we shall find some way of insuring religious teaching to our children without sacrificing that fundamental American principle of separation of church and state.

HANDBOOK OF CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

The Handbook of Christian Education, a veritable mine of factual data in exceedingly compact form, is now on the press and will be available within a few weeks. Never before has the Council attempted anything so comprehensive and so practically useful. Let a few illustrations suffice: the *Handbook* lists the important church boards of education, the leading allied organizations and educational foundations, with official personnel; all colleges and secondary schools affiliated with our own Boards, showing church affiliation, recognition by standardizing agencies, number of students, number of faculty, value of plant, productive endowment, current budget, chief officer, departments of Bible and Religious Education. All Protestant theological schools of the country are reported and like data have been requested from them. A comparative table of standards of official accrediting agencies for colleges, junior colleges and secondary schools is included. All known schools of religion and the names of all Board representatives at work in tax-supported and independent institutions are given. Advance orders for the *Handbook* are now being taken at 50 cents per copy. Address the Council office, 111 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON NORMAL SCHOOLS*

KATHARINE C. FOSTER

Quoting from A. W. Belding, of the *Journal of Education*, the Committee presents the report of the year's study.

There is no room in the teaching profession for the chronic pessimist or cynic. Belief in human capabilities of growth and improvement is a fundamental necessity of teaching. Without such belief, the teacher is guilty of engaging in a fraudulent transaction. Faithless teaching hurts the teacher and the taught.

With this as our premise, we have made an effort to discover the plans and methods now effective in the churches and other religious organizations among the students of institutions for teacher-training.

Two factors seem to be of determining influence in every situation observed:

- (1) The degree and quality of coördination of effort among local churches, their church leaders, in approaching the students.

Where the campus has felt the strain of competing interests, all in the name of the Christian church, the results have been distrust and dissatisfaction.

Where the pastors or other representatives of the church and Christian associations have recognized their respective contributions, but harmoniously coördinated their activities to meet the problems of student and community life, the confidence of administration and undergraduate has been gained.

Often the initiative has come from faculty members in the local churches, but more often the church officials have undertaken such joint responsibility themselves.

- (2) The equipment of the local church in many communities is seriously handicapping the work.

This may be true for physical equipment or available leadership among church membership.

* Adopted by the Council of Church Boards of Education, Atlantic City, New Jersey, January 10, 1928.

Remedies have been found by a number of the denominations in financial assistance, or the placement of full- or part-time student secretaries.

This introduces a question worthy of further study, since we may be in danger of duplication of effort, or of yielding to the insistence of centers already capable of providing local leadership.

The purpose and content of programs of religious education, whether formal or informal, involve another element, as varied as the schools. We are depending upon the current surveys of the denominational Boards of Education to supply necessary facts upon this subject beyond these now accessible ones. We are in general agreement that provision for expression and development of personal religion is needed, and that to meet life situations the students desire also to secure some "technique of religious education" which they may use as leaders in the communities to which they go as teachers. Therefore, some kind of laboratory experimentation should be possible, such as the Sunday evening hour for young people, or "deputation" demonstrations. Whether the local church can provide these opportunities or whether a plan similar to the School of Religion with recognized credit should be developed, depends upon local conditions, legal provisions and the ability of the church Boards to secure adequately prepared leadership.

We recommend, in presenting this report, that another year of intensive study of the Normal Schools and Teachers' Colleges be followed by the Council of Church Boards of Education, and that any matters of personnel or policy be referred to the University Committee, in consultation with the Normal School Committee of the Council.

Respectfully submitted,

MARY E. MARKLEY,

H. H. SWEETS,

KATHARINE CONDON FOSTER, *Chairman.*

THE WORKER'S BOOKSHELF

Why Stop Learning?—Dorothy Canfield Fisher. Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1927, \$2.00.

The outstanding note of Mrs. Fisher's book is a joyous and expanding hope. All through the pages devoted to an exposition of the means available to adults for enriching their lives, there races a newly discovered and contagiously presented joy in good things just ahead for all who seek.

The baby and the growing youth deal with concrete things—the rattle and the test-tube. It is not until we have found our place in the material world that we begin to reflect upon the meaning of it. If when we reach the reflective age, which is maturity, there has been built into our lives nothing as to the meaning of the universe, and no agency for searching out that meaning, we continue to apply to it the only method we know—the laboratory method. We have the result in material-mindedness, experimental emotionalism, companionate marriages and the like.

Emotionalism, unchecked by ideals, breeds nationalism, class consciousness, sectionalism, race prejudice and religious intolerance. Cheap journalism flourishes because of a lack of mature, critical judgment. Reason plods, but propaganda races. All because we have not carried education into the mature, reflective years of life. American emphasis in education has been on earning a living rather than on learning for living. Mrs. Fisher challenges us to the fact that education is not a preparation for a life of some sort, but is a normal part of all living. The adult has his own capacities and characteristics which are not available at any other time of life. To fail to "bring them forth" at that age is not only to cripple that adult but to rob others of the unique contribution of truth which God has entrusted to that individual for our common advancement. Adult education, therefore, is neither a fad nor a temporary expedient, but an earnest effort to unify the whole life of man and to enrich its meaning from the ripened thought and mature experience of adult years.

THEODORE R. LUDLOW.

THE EFFECTIVE COLLEGE

A book of 300 pages setting forth the most approved ideals and procedure regarding curricula, faculty-student relations, effective teaching, promotion of scholarship, the place of religion and the fine arts in education, and the problems of finance. Price \$2.00 per copy. Published by the Association of American Colleges, 111 Fifth Ave., New York, N. Y.

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION

Robert L. Kelly

I. *Ideals for the Effective College*

The American College of the Twentieth Century

Frank Aydelotte, President, Swarthmore College

A Secondary Function of the College

John R. Effinger, Dean, University of Michigan

The Effective College Home

Kerr D. Macmillan, President, Wells College

The College Within the University

Max Mason, President, The University of Chicago

II. *The Effective College Curriculum*

College Entrance Requirements

Clyde Furst, Secretary, The Carnegie Foundation for the
Advancement of Teaching

Remaking the College Curriculum

Robert L. Kelly, Permanent Executive Officer, Association
of American CollegesIII. *Faculty-Student Relationships*

Faculty-Student Cooperation

Ernest H. Wilkins, President, Oberlin College

The Relations between Faculty and Students

Clarence C. Little, President, University of Michigan

Personnel Technique and Freshman Guidance

Adam Leroy Jones, Director of Admissions, Columbia
University

The Small College and Personnel Procedure

Raymond Walters, Dean, Swarthmore College

IV. *Effective Teaching*

Does Research Interfere with Teaching?

Edward A. Pace, Vice-Rector, The Catholic University
of America

The Contribution of the Library to Effective Teaching

Silas Evans, President, Ripon College

Sectioning on the Basis of Ability

Lucius H. Holt, Acting-Dean, The United States Military Academy

V. *The Promotion of Scholarship*

Honors Courses at Swarthmore College

Robert C. Brooks, Professor, Swarthmore College

The Comprehensive Examination

John S. P. Tatlock, Professor, Harvard University

VI. *Music and the Arts of Design*

Music in the Liberal College

Thomas Whitney Surette, Lecturer, Graduate School of Education, Harvard University

The Study of Art in our Colleges

Edward Robinson, Director, The Metropolitan Museum of Art

Architecture of the Effective College

Herbert C. Wise

VII. *Religion in the Effective College*

Religion in a Liberal Education

Herbert E. Hawkes, Dean, Columbia University

Religion in the Denominational College

William E. Smyser, Dean, Ohio Wesleyan University

Religion in the Catholic College

James H. Ryan, Executive Secretary, National Catholic Welfare Conference

VIII. *Financing the Effective College*

An Analysis of the Financial Needs of a College of Liberal Arts for One Thousand Students—A Summary

Donald J. Cowling, President, Carleton College

How Can the Financial Needs of a College of One Thousand Students Effectively be Met?

Trevor Arnett, Member of the General Education Board

The Business Administration of an Effective College

William O. Miller, Comptroller, University of Pennsylvania

The Cost of Education in an Effective College

Floyd W. Reeves, Director, Bureau of School Service, University of Kentucky

IX. *The College of the Future*

The Outlook for the American College

A. Lawrence Lowell, President, Harvard University

Bibliography

INDEX